

REMARKS

The present application was filed on October 10, 2003 with claims 1-35. Claims 9 and 23 have been canceled without prejudice, and claims 11-14 and 26-34 have been provisionally withdrawn. Claims 1-8, 10, 15-22, 24, 25, and 35 remain pending and claims 1, 15, 25, and 35 are the pending independent claims.

In the outstanding Office Action dated April 6, 2007, the Examiner: (i) rejected claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 15, 16, 21, 22, 24, 25, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over S. Tuecke et al. "Grid Service Specification," (hereinafter "Tuecke") in view of S. Abiteboul, "Issues in Monitoring Web Data," (hereinafter "Abiteboul"); (ii) rejected claims 5, 6, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuecke in view of Abiteboul, and further in view of P. Brittenham, "An Overview of the Web Services Inspection Language," (hereinafter "Brittenham"); and (iv) rejected claims 3, 4, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuecke in view of Abiteboul and L. Lim et al., "Characterizing Web Document Change," (hereinafter "Lim").

With regard to the various §103 rejections, Applicants initially note that a proper case of obviousness has not been presented if the references, when combined, do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Furthermore, the claimed subject matter is not obvious if there is no suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the references or to modify the reference teachings. An analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be explicit and should not be based on mere conclusory statements. *See KSR v. Teleflex*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1741, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (U.S., Apr. 30, 2007), quoting *In re Kahn*, 441 F. 3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006) ("[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.").

With regard to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 15, 16, 21, 22, 24, 25, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(b) as being unpatentable over Tuecke in view of Abiteboul, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 15, 25, and 35. Applicants respectfully reassert that the combined teaching of

Tuecke and Abiteboul fail to render the recited claims obvious.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 15, 25, and 35 to clarify the subject matter covered by the recited claims. Independent claims 1, 15, 25, and 35 now recite “wherein the searching step is configurable to be performed to a user-specified level of granularity for at least one of a depth of search and a detection of changes.” Support for these amendments can be found in the Specification at page 11, lines 8-11 and lines 12-13; page 12, lines 7-11; and page 16, lines 4-14. It follows that none of the cited references render the recited claims obvious because none of the references teach or suggest the claim limitation of a user-specified level of granularity for at least one of a depth of search and a detection of changes.

With regard to the Examiner’s contention that Abiteboul describes “automatic detection of changes . . . and automatically collecting,” (Office Action, page 2, paragraph 5) Applicants assert that neither Abiteboul nor Tuecke teach or suggest automatic detection and automatic collection with regard to changed service description documents. The Examiner concedes that Tuecke does not describe automatic detection of changes and automatic collection. Office Action, page 4, paragraph 12. Further, Applicants assert that Abiteboul fails to remedy the deficient teaching of Tuecke.

First, Applicants note that Abiteboul does not discuss service description documents as recited in the claims. The Specification describes service description documents “like Extensible Markup Language (XML) based WS-Inspection (or WSIL, for short) documents.” Specification, page 1, lines 15-18. Abiteboul does not disclose the use of an inspection language like WSIL. It follows that Abiteboul does not disclose the automatic detection of changes in one or more attributes of the one or more changed service description documents. Also, Abiteboul does not disclose automatic collection of at least a portion of the one or more changed service description documents.

Abiteboul discloses a semi-automatic wrapping of data sources, which is unlike what is recited in the claims. Abiteboul, page 3, last paragraph:

The wrapping of data sources is mostly performed today semi-automatically from HTML pages. An engineer examines a collection of pages with similar structure and tailors a program to extract information from it. The weakness of this approach is that it has to remain limited to a reasonably small number of sites and page styles.

Applicants initially note that Abiteboul teaches a semi-automatic system, not an automatic system. Next, Abiteboul teaches wrapping of data sources which does not teach or suggest the recited claims. Further, the cited text does not describe the claim limitations, rather, Abiteboul discusses the weakness of the site wrap and monitoring approach and explains how “[artificial] intelligent monitoring of the web should rely on semantics published by web sites, which seems to take us a bit far into the future.” Abiteboul, page 4, first partial paragraph. The relevance of the cited text to the recited claims is unclear and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the §103 rejection.

Next, none of the cited references teach or suggest a searching step configurable to be performed to a user-specified level of granularity for at least one of a depth of search and a detection of changes. The Examiner concedes that Tuecke does not describe a user-specified level of granularity. Office Action, page 4, paragraph 12. Applicants further assert that Abiteboul fails to remedy the deficient teaching of Tuecke. Granularity is disclosed in the Specification in an illustrative embodiment at page 12, lines 7-11. The Specification discloses a configurable exploration mechanism in which the depth of web services inspection (WSIL) links to traverse is configurable. *See* Specification page 12, line 7-11. Further, the granularity for the detection of changes (chain change detection) is also configurable. *See* Specification, page 16, line 4-14. Applicants respectfully note that the example cited in Abiteboul describing the installation of triggers for a particular camera in a catalogue is irrelevant. Office Action, page 2, paragraph 5. Abiteboul makes no mention of configuring the level of granularity for depth of search or detection of changes as disclosed in the Specification and recited in the claims. For at least these reasons, the cited references do not render the recited claims obvious.

Dependent claims 2, 7, 8, 10, 16 and 21, 22, and 24 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 15, and also contain patentable subject matter in their own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 15, 16, 21, 22, 24, 25, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 5, 6, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

unpatentable over Tuecke in view of Abiteboul and Brittenham, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited combination fails to at least meet the limitations of the independent claims. Brittenham discloses an overview of the Web Services Inspection Language, a service discovery mechanism that addresses a different subset of requirements using a distributed usage model, but fails to remedy the deficiencies described above with regard to the amended independent claims and the combination of Tuecke and Abiteboul. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 5, 6, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 3, 4, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuecke in view of Abiteboul and Lim, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited combination fails to at least meet the limitations of the independent claims. Lim discloses a study on how web documents change, but fails to remedy the deficiencies described above with regard to the amended independent claims and the combination of Tuecke and Abiteboul. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 3, 4, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-8, 10, 15-22, 24, 25, and 35 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William E. Lewis", is written over the typed name and title.

William E. Lewis
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39,274
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-2946

Date: October 31, 2007